

**Questions regarding filter pitcher proposal, revised August 29, 2019**

**RFP posting: <https://das.nh.gov/purchasing/specRFP.asp?rfplD=13115>**

**Questions received prior to conference call July 15, 2:00-3:00**

1. What was WIC's involvement in the development of this project/RFP? Are they already on board for implementation of the project?  
*Both the State Agency WIC Director and the four local agency WIC directors were consulted during the development of the RFP and fully support the project.*
2. Are there existing DHHS/DES translation resources that can be leveraged by the Contractor?  
*WIC uses the DHHS resources for translating material. We believe we could use this resource.*
3. Will this project require IRB approval? If so, will the Contractor be responsible for this process and associated costs?  
*The project will not require IRB approval.*
4. On page 2, the RFP says "Evaluating and making adjustments to project design materials, etc. This may involve substantial changes such as including additional water test parameters such as lead. Any substantial change would require approval from NHDES, the PAC, and the Commission." Can you elaborate on what factors will be considered in determining if additional water test parameters will be considered? How do you foresee this impacting the scope of work for the Contractor?  
*The Contractor will be expected to make recommendations regarding any changes to the project design as a result of experience gained during the pilot. DES' and DHHS' decision regarding changing testing parameters would also take into account PAC guidance because that would be a significant change in scope of the project. A key task of the Contractor is to conduct program evaluation, which will include recommendations for continuous quality improvement. Important factors to be considered in making any changes would include effect on participation and compliance rates.*
5. Are there any limitations or requirements for how the \$150,000 for the Contractor's expenses are spread over the 5 years?  
*No, the respondent may determine the most advantageous way to spread out the level of effort over the course of the project.*
6. How many languages is the contractor expected to accommodate for the training and information materials? In the case of the filter pitcher stickers for which the NHDES is providing the design, how many languages will they be in?  
*English is the expected language for training local WIC staff. NH WIC provides most materials in English and Spanish, so the sticker should include Spanish. Materials are translated into other languages as needed.*

7. How many languages will need to be supported by phone/text? Will immediate phone translation be expected?  
*English and Spanish are expected for phone and text support. Immediate phone translation is expected for supporting participants enrolled in the project.*
8. Is WIC clinic staff orientation expected to be in-person?  
*Not necessarily; the respondent may choose a cost-effective medium or combination of media.*
9. How many WIC clinic locations are expected to be in the pilot program? How many total WIC clinics in the full program?  
*The number of WIC clinics included in the pilot project implementation will be determined based on an assessment by the Contractor and guidance from DES on zip codes most at risk. It is expected that all NH WIC clinics will be involved in the full project implementation.*
10. Page 3, Item 6 of the RFP requires “Supporting pitcher-using participants for 24 months by phone, text, and online...” What type of online support will be required? Will a website for the project be needed to provide project information, updates, and contact information?  
*The respondent may propose, and should describe, an appropriate and effective blend of formats for online support.*

#### **Questions during July 15 conference call**

11. How far along is the project design?  
*A project flow-chart has been developed and was included with the RFP. While it is expected that the contractor will expand upon and refine the project design, it is expected that it will follow this basic flow.*
12. How many iterations are expected for review and revision of materials developed by the Contractor?  
*DES/DHHS do not have a number in mind. We recognize that the number of iterations should be kept to a minimum. The number will depend on the quality of the first draft. Materials prepared for the pilot would probably require more revision than materials prepared for the full-scale project.*
13. Have DES/DHHS settled on the Zero Water pitcher?  
*Yes, Zero Water is the only pitcher that we have determined to be effective at a wide range of arsenic influent concentrations.*
14. Who will do the water testing?

*As described in the funding proposal the NHDHHS Public Health Laboratory (PHL) will do the sample analysis. Sample bottles will be provided to the Contractor, who will prepare test kits (including instructions and a prepaid return mailer) to the WIC clinics, whose staff will provide the kits to project participants. Participants will take water samples and mail them to the PHL, who will provide results to the participant and the Contractor.*

15. With respect to consent forms, does the state have standard forms?

*NHDHHS has forms that can be adapted by the Contractor for use in the project. Forms would have to be reviewed by NHDHHS legal staff and possibly by USDA (the source of WIC funding), but this is not a lengthy process.*

**Question received 8/29/2019**

16. Is NHDES working with ZeroWater directly, and is ZeroWater the source of the pricing information we used?

*ZeroWater is the source of the pricing used as the basis for our budget. While the RFP states, "The cost of water sampling bottles, water sample analysis, pitchers, replacement filter cartridges, coupons for obtaining additional filter cartridges, and shipping of those materials to the Contractor will be borne directly by NHDES, and will not be required to be included in the amount of the subject contract, as detailed in the "Cost and Time" section on page 4 of this RFP," if a respondent can propose an equally effective pitcher at the same or lower total cost we would entertain such a proposal.*

END